

Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

27. (Newly Added) The method as set forth in claim 25, wherein the printing of the conditional game information comprises varying the conditional game information with respect to the location along a length of the web.

28. (Newly Added) The method as set forth in claim 24, wherein the printing of the conditional game information comprises varying the conditional game information with respect to the printing of the categorical game information.

#### REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of February 16, 2000. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for revising the Information Disclosure Statement to refer to the correct patent number and for his consideration of all publications.

The Examiner objected to the drawings on several grounds. First of all, the Examiner objected to the drawings since they do not include a ply B that was referenced on page 15 of the application. The specification inadvertently recited ply "B" and has now been changed to ply "5." As a second ground, the Examiner objected to the drawings since reference numerals 140, 142, 144, 146, 148, 150, 240,

and 474 up were not included in the written description. With reference to Fig. 2, these reference numerals refer to the lengths of the weakened portions along perforation 104. The specification accordingly been revised to refer to the elements referenced by these numbers. Thirdly, the Examiner objected to the drawings since reference number "220" was used to refer to two separate elements. Figure 5 has been revised to contain a number "221" instead of "220" in order to remove this redundant use of reference numerals. The objections to the drawings should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to claims 17 to 23 because of some informalities. The Examiner argued that the use of "may" in the claims renders the meaning of the claims unclear. In order to avoid any possible ambiguity, the claims have been revised so that they no longer recite "may." With regard to claim 17, the Examiner found the claims to be vague because of the phrase "high resolution." Claim 17 has been revised to specify that the fields of the game pieces associated with the repetitive printing process have "higher resolution" than a resolution of the fields through the variable printing process. Since the claims now provide a basis of comparison, the claims are no longer indefinite. The Examiner is requested to withdraw the objections to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 16 to 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner questioned how the resulting game pieces can be printed in a manner that is not repetitive when the methods involve a repetitive printing process.

In addition to the rejection under § 112, second paragraph, the Examiner also rejected all of the claims in view of one or more references. The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,398,708 to Goldman et al., rejected claim 17 under § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,772,510 to Roberts, rejected claim 18 under §103 as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,667,250 to Behm et al., rejected claims 19 and 21 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,893,559 to Sillars, and rejected claims 20 and 22 under § 103 as unpatentable over Roberts in view of Behm et al. and further in view of Sillars.

With this Amendment, the claims have been revised to define more clearly the subject matter of the claimed invention. With reference to Figure 6, a conventional method of printing game pieces used only repetitive printing processes. As shown in the Figure, a grid 300 of game pieces includes fields printed with categorical game information and fields printed with conditional information. The categorical information identify sets or classes of interest in the game whereas the conditional information relates to the playing of the game. As an example, the game pieces may comprise Monopoly® game pieces used by McDonald's in promoting its food and drinks. These game pieces have categorical information which defines the various neighborhoods in Monopoly®, or other such groups of properties. For instance, one category may be the Boardwalk and Park Place neighborhood whereas a second

category might be the collection of railroads. The conditional information then specifies the particular street or property within that class. For instance, the conditional information distinguishes Boardwalk from Park Place, even though both would have a category defined by the color blue. As described with reference to Figure 6, the conventional printing processes formed patterns of game pieces and were thus predictable. This predictability can be seen by the fourth row of game pieces 374, 380, 386, and 392 which are identical to the first row of game pieces 302, 308, 314, and 320.

To overcome the problems of the conventional printing process of such game pieces, the invention involves a combination of repetitive printing of first indicia and variable printing of second indicia. The first indicia preferably comprises categorical information and the second indicia preferably comprises the conditional game information. Thus, using the example of the Monopoly® game, the repetitive printing process defines the categories of neighborhoods and other properties on the web of game pieces and the variable printing process places the individual streets or properties within those groups of properties. Thus, the repetitive printing process would create the blue category for Boardwalk and Park Place and the variable printing process would selectively insert either Boardwalk or Park Place. Because the invention involves the variable printing of conditional game information, the game

pieces are produced in a manner that “is not repetitive and that inhibits prediction of game outcomes” (see claims 16 and 17).

The references relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest the claimed method of producing a web of game pieces using both repetitive and variable printing processes. For instance, with the system disclosed in Roberts, the game pieces are partially printed with game indicia and then at another location, such as at the retail venue, supplemental game indicia are printed. In contrast, the invention relates to a method of printing the web of game pieces in which the repetitive and variable printing occur both on the web so that a grid of game pieces are formed that have both repetitive and variable printing. The references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims do not suggest the claimed invention.

In rejecting the claims under § 112, second paragraph, the Examiner questioned how game pieces may be printed in a non-repetitive manner when the claims refer to a repetitive printing process. To clarify this point, claim 16 has been amended to state that the method is for printing on “a grid of promotional game pieces on a web” and that the repetitive printing forms “combinations of first indicia and second indicia.” In the example shown in Figure 7, the first indicia defines the category and the variable printing process registers the second indicia to form combinations of variable and repetitive printing.



In addition to referring to the combinations of first and second indicia, claim 16 has also been amended to clarify that the variable printing process “selectively places the second indicia on the grid with the first indicia.” Returning to the example of Figure 7, the play condition information that is variable printed is selectively placed with the category game information. Thus, play condition six may be placed in category F as shown with game piece 432 or may be placed in category C as shown with game piece 486. The ability to form combinations of repetitive printing with variable printing and to selectively place the variable printing with the repetitive printing is not suggested by any of the references relied upon by the Examiner, whereby claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17 and 24 are also allowable. These claims both state that indicia that are categorical in nature are printed using a repetitive printing process and indicia that are conditional in nature are printed using a variable printing process. As described on page 23 of the application, the categorical game information can identify information regarding sets or classes of interest in the game. The conditional information, as described on page 24, relates to playing of the game such as outcomes, redeemable subject matter, etc. Claim 24 states that the categorical game information includes “information identifying sets of game pieces” and that the conditional game information defines “unique game pieces within the sets of game pieces.” The references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims do not suggest printing

categorical information using a repetitive process and printing conditional game information using a variable process. Claims 17 through 28 are therefore in condition for allowance.

In rejecting claim 17 under § 112, second paragraph, the Examiner argued that the claim is indefinite because “categorical in nature” and “conditional in nature” are broad. The Examiner also argued that these terms depend upon one’s point of view, which consequently renders the claim indefinite. The terms categorical and conditional are not indefinite when read in light of the specification. The term categorical, as described on page 23, refers to indicia that defines categories or sets of game pieces. On the other hand, conditional information, as described on page 24, relates to the playing of the game, such as the outcome or redeemable subject matter. These terms are more than adequately defined by the specification and are therefore not indefinite. Furthermore, the breadth of these terms should not be confused with indefiniteness. A claim may contain broad language and is not indefinite merely because it uses such broad language. The rejection of claim 17 as being indefinite under § 112, second paragraph, should therefore be withdrawn.

The invention provides other advantages over the references cited by the Examiner. For instance, the conditional game information can be varied with respect to the location within the web (see claim 25), either along a width of the web or along a length of the web as mentioned (see claims 26 and 27). Furthermore, the



Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

conditional game information can be varied with respect to the printing of the categorical game information (see claim 28). With reference to the example shown in Figure 7, the game pieces with category A can have the conditional game information of "Play Condition 1," "Play Condition 7" or "Play Condition 12." Thus, with the invention, the conditional game information can be selectively applied anywhere on the web and can be selectively placed in certain categories. The references relied upon by the Examiner do not suggest these advantages of the invention. The Examiner is therefore requested to indicate that claims 16 to 28 are allowable.

For at least the above reasons, claims 16 to 28 are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that can place this application in even better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining matters.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Order Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Geoff L. Sutcliffe  
Reg. No. 36,348

OF COUNSEL:  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530  
404-815-6530